arXiv:1608.03635v1 [math.CO] 11 Aug 2016

PROOF OF XIONG'S CONJECTURED REFINEMENT OF EULER'S PARTITION THEOREM

WILLIAM J. KEITH

Abstract. In a recent preprint, Xinhua Xiong conjectured a refinement of Euler's partition theorem that partitions with distinct parts are equinumerous with those into odd parts. His conjecture applies to all moduli and generalizes a result of Pak and Postnikov on partitions with all parts having the same residue with respect to a given modulus. This note bijectively proves Xiong's conjecture in its full generality.

1. Introduction

A partition of n is a nonincreasing sequence of positive integers that sums to n. Typical notations include the sequence notation $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \dots)$ and the frequency notation $\pi = \pi_1^{e_1}\pi_2^{e_2}\dots$ denoting that parts of size π_i appear e_i times. It is also sometimes convenient to assume an infinite tail of parts of size zero. Given λ, we say that $|\lambda| = n$.

Euler's theorem that the number of partitions of an integer n into odd parts is equal to the number of partitions of n into distinct parts has been generalized and refined in many ways over the centuries. Sylvester provided a bijective proof [6] which Bessenrodt [1] proved implied the refinement that, for a given ℓ, the number of partitions λ of n into exactly ℓ odd parts is equal to the number of partitions of n into distinct parts for which the alternating sum

$$\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 + \dots$$

is also equal to ℓ.

Many other authors have refined Euler's identity in different ways by introducing additional statistics and showing various equivalences. In his extensive survey of partition bijections [3], Pak notes the strange fact that the bijections that prove these equivalences, constructed with different descriptions, nevertheless almost always end up being the same as Sylvester's original bijection.

A different direction to take Euler's theorem is to generalize by considering other moduli. In [4], Pak and Postnikov give the theorem, for $0 \neq c < m$:

Theorem 1. *The number of partitions of n with all parts $\equiv c \pmod m$ equals the number of partitions of n in which $(e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \dots) = (c, m-c, c, m-c, \dots)$.*

Euler's theorem is then clearly the $m = 2$ case of this result, with necessarily $c = 1$.

The refinements that arise from considering new statistics and the generalizations to all moduli and different residue classes can be unified and extended. In the

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05A17, 11P83.
Key words and phrases. partitions.

author's doctoral thesis [2], a chapter is devoted to various identities of this nature, such as for *m-falling* or *m-rising* partitions, those in which least positive residues of each part modulo m form a nonincreasing or nondecreasing sequence.

The conjecture of interest in this paper is another identity in this direction, advanced by Xinhua Xiong in a recent preprint [7]. Fix a modulus m. For a partition into parts not divisible by m, known as an *m-regular* partition, define its *length type* be the $(m-1)$-tuple $(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots, \ell_{m-1})$ when there are a total of ℓ_i parts of λ that have residue i modulo m. Define any partition's *alternating sum type* to be the $(m-1)$-tuple $(s_1, \ldots, s_{m-1})$ when

$$s_i = \lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1} + \lambda_{m+i} - \lambda_{m+i+1} + \lambda_{2m+i} - \lambda_{2m+i-1} + \ldots.$$

With these definitions observe that Pak and Postnikov's theorem states an equivalence between m-regular partitions of a specific length type (all entries are 0 except for ℓ_c) and those of the same alternating sum type (since differences $\lambda_{km} - \lambda_{km+1}$ do not contribute to the alternating sum type, only s_c is nonzero).

Let P be the set of partitions in which each part can be repeated at most $m-1$ times, and Q the set of *m-regular* partitions. Then Xiong advances the conjecture (Conjecture 2.1 in [7]) that the number of partitions of n in P with any given $(m-1)$-tuple as an alternating sum type equals the number of partitions of n in Q whose length type is the same $(m-1)$-tuple. In generating functions, this becomes

Conjecture 1.

$$\sum_{\lambda \in P} {z_1}^{s_1(\lambda)} \cdots {z_{m-1}}^{s_{m-1}(\lambda)} q^{|\lambda|} = \sum_{\mu \in Q} {z_1}^{\ell_1(\mu)} \cdots {z_{m-1}}^{\ell_{m-1}(\mu)} q^{|\mu|}.$$

Pak and Postnikov's theorem follows by extracting coefficients on terms of type $(0, \ldots, 0, x, 0, \ldots)$. Xiong proves the conjecture for a number of special cases and applies the conjecture to conditionally deduce several companion theorems to famous partition theorems, such as, for the Rogers-Ramanujan identities,

Theorem 2. *Conditionally on the conjecture, the number of partitions of n into parts differing by 2 which may (resp. may not) have 1 as a part equals the number of partitions of n with parts repeated at most 4 times which have alternating sum type $(s_1, 0, 0, s_4)$ (resp. $(0, s_2, s_3, 0)$) with (s_1, s_4) (resp. (s_2, s_3)) $\neq (0, 0)$.*

In the following section we show that Xiong's conjecture is proved for all cases by a bijection originally due to Stockhofe in [5] (an English translation of the original German can be found as an appendix to [2]), slightly extended and specialized for the present purpose. All concepts and claims necessary will be defined and proved here to keep the paper self-contained. Presentation will be substantially streamlined from the original much more general map for application to our purpose.

2. Proof of the conjecture

We begin with a simple lemma.

Lemma 1. *The conjugates λ' of partitions λ with alternating sum type $(s_1, \ldots, s_{m-1})$ are precisely those partitions in which the parts not divisible by m, read as a partition, form a partition of length type $(s_1, \ldots, s_{m-1})$.*

Proof. Suppose $\lambda_{km+i} - \lambda_{km+i+1} = c$ contributes a nonzero amount to s_i. Then in the conjugate partition, c parts of size $km+i$ appear. The converse also holds. □

Call *m-flat* a partition in which all differences between consecutive parts are strictly less than m and the smallest part is less than m. We will thus prove by bijection that

Theorem 3. *There is a bijection between m-regular partitions of any given length type $(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{m-1})$ and m-flat partitions of the same length type.*

Proof. In fact, the bijection even preserves the sequential order of the nonzero residues modulo m; our map will consist of rearranging units of size m.

It is useful to define two operations analogous to scalar multiplication and vector addition on partitions. For convenience, assume that all partitions are equipped with infinite tails consisting solely of zeros. The scalar multiple of a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ by the positive integer m is the partition $m\lambda = (m\lambda_1, m\lambda_2, \dots)$. Given two partitions $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ and $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots)$, we can define their (infinite-dimensional) vector sum $\lambda + \mu = (\lambda_1 + \mu_1, \lambda_2 + \mu_2, \dots)$. (Partition addition in the literature sometimes means taking the nonincreasing sequence of the multiset union of all parts of both partitions; we will not require this operation.)

Begin with an m-flat partition. We will remove multiples of m to construct a partition π, via a sequence of intermediate partitions $\lambda^{(0)}$, $\lambda^{(1)}$, $\lambda^{(2)}$, etc. As we do so, we will use the removed multiples of m to construct a second partition $m\sigma = (m\sigma_1, m\sigma_2, \dots)$.

Initialize $\sigma = ()$, the empty partition.

Step 1. First, construct $\lambda^{(0)}$ by removing from λ any parts divisible by m for which, after removal, the partition $\lambda^{(0)}$ is still m-flat. These will be parts such that

- $\lambda_i = k_i m = \lambda_{i+1}$, i.e. all but the last of a repeated part divisible by m;
- $\lambda_1 = k_1 m$ if the largest part is divisible by m; or
- parts $\lambda_i = k_i m$, $i > 1$, such that $\lambda_{i-1} = k_i m + j_1$, $\lambda_{i+1} = (k_i - 1)m + j_2$, with $0 < j_1 < j_2 < m$.

Thus the remaining parts divisible by m in $\lambda^{(0)}$ are all distinct, not the largest (or smallest) parts, and any remaining part $\lambda_i = k_i m$ lies between $\lambda_{i-1} = k_i m + j_1$ and $\lambda_{i+1} = (k_i - 1)m + j_2$ with $0 < j_2 \le j_1 < m$.

For each part $\lambda_i = k_i m$ removed, add $k_i m$ to $m\sigma$ as a part.

For the previous step, the order of removal did not matter, although of course $m\sigma$ is arranged in nonincreasing order. In the next step, we work from the largest part divisible by m to the smallest.

Step 2. Begin with $\lambda^{(0)}$ and set $j = 0$.

(1) If $\lambda^{(j)}$ has no parts divisible by m, stop.
(2) If $\lambda_i = k_i m$ is the largest part in $\lambda^{(j)}$ divisible by m, remove λ_i from $\lambda^{(j)}$. Renumber following parts.
(3) In addition, reduce by m all parts λ_1 through λ_{i-1}. The remaining partition is now $\lambda^{(j+1)}$. Increment j.
(4) Add $m(k_i + i - 1)$ to $m\sigma$ as a part.
(5) Repeat.

The following lemma concerning parts removed in Step 2 will be useful when we wish to prove that this process is reversible.

Lemma 2. *Parts added to σ in Step 2 are always at least the size of those removed in Step 1, and are added in nondecreasing order of size. The largest possible size of a part added to $m\sigma$ in Step 2 is the number of parts in λ not divisible by m.*

Proof. If λ is an m-flat partition and $\lambda_i = k_i m + j_1$, with $\lambda_{i+c} = (k_i - 1)m + j_2$ the next smaller part which is nonzero modulo m, this necessarily requires $0 < j_1 < j_2 < m$. In this case refer to λ_i as a *descent* of λ. If a part $k_i m$ appears between λ_i and λ_{i+c} defining a descent, we speak of $k_i m$ as appearing within the descent.

Parts divisible by m are not the largest part of $\lambda^{(j)}$ and do not appear within descents of $\lambda^{(j)}$: these were removed in Step 1.

Suppose part $\lambda_i = k_i m$ appears in $\lambda^{(j)}$, so that when removed we will add part $m(k_i + i - 1)$ to $m\sigma$. The next part, if any, which will be removed is $\lambda_{i+s-1} = k_{i+s-1}m$, $s \geq 2$, after the renumbering. (That is, it was λ_{i+s} before renumbering.)

We have $k_{i+s-1} < k_i$, decreasing by exactly 1 for each descent passed as we read from (after renumbering) λ_i to λ_{i+s-1}, plus 1 immediately, in essence thinking of the passage from $k_i m$ to λ_i as a descent. The total decrease is at most $s - 1$, since λ_{i+s-2} and λ_{i+s-1} cannot be descents (parts $k_i m$ in Step 2 do not appear within descents).

On the other hand, the number of parts added due to subtraction from previous parts always increases by $s - 1$: one for each part passed regardless of whether it is a descent or not, less 1 because 1 fewer part exists prior to λ_{i+s-1} after removal of λ_i. Thus we have $k_{i+s-1} + (i + s - 1) - 1 \geq k_i + i - 1$.

This likewise holds for the first part removed in Step 2, taking $i = 0$ for a potential largest part. The first $k_i + i - 1$ removed in Step 2 is decreased from this size by at most i and increased by i exactly.

Finally, the largest a part removed in Step 2 can be is if we add as much as possible, with steps across descents being irrelevant; that is, the largest possible part that could be removed is a part $\lambda_i = m$ which is the next-to-last part, followed by a single part not divisible by m. Since all previous parts divisible by m would have been removed at this step, clearly in this case $1 + i - 1$ is exactly the number of parts in λ not divisible by m. By the previous clauses, this is the largest removal.

Thus all claims of the lemma hold. □

Step 3. After Step 2, we now have some $\lambda^{(j)}$ which is simultaneously m-regular and m-flat, and $m\sigma$ consisting of parts divisible by m. Set $\pi = \lambda^{(j)}$. Our final partition is $\pi + m(\sigma')$. Since by our lemma the largest part of σ was less than or equal to the number of parts in λ not divisible by m, its conjugate has at most this number of parts, so we only add multiples of m to such parts in π. The resulting partition has all parts not divisible by m.

We now briefly show that the map is reversible. Starting with a partition μ into parts not divisible by m, we will construct a sequence of partitions $\pi^{(j)}$ which begin with the m-flat, m-regular portion of μ and have parts from σ inserted.

Step 3 Reverse. It is easy to break a partition μ into a flat plart plus a collection of parts divisible by m, as $\pi + m(\sigma')$. Whenever $\mu_i - \mu_{i+1} \geq m$ (including for the smallest part: treat the next part as 0), add 1 to σ' for parts 1 through i. Subtract m from all parts μ_1 through μ_i. When done with all possible removals, conjugate σ' to obtain σ.

Step 2 Reverse. Observe that if we wish to insert a part $m\sigma_1$ into π, we must determine whether it is to be inserted in the reverse of Step 2 or Step 1. Step 2 insertions occur when part $m\sigma_1$ is larger than k_1 for $(\pi^{(j)})_1 = k_1 m + j_1$. The position where such a part can be inserted is unique, since by the proof of Lemma 2 there can be only one i such that $\sigma_1 = k_i + i - 1$ and in which $m\sigma_1$ would not be appearing within a descent. Passing a column that is not a descent changes the

amount to be added; passing a column that is a descent does not, but is not a place where parts are added in Step 2.

Step 1 Reverse. This step is easy since the order in which parts are inserted will not matter. Once parts are small enough that they can be inserted into $\pi^{(j)}$ while retaining flatness, insert all at once. A part of size $k_i m$ will go precisely after a part of size $k_i m$ if one already exists, or within the descent at $\lambda_i = k_i m + j_1$ if the next part is not divisible by m.

The result is our desired m-flat partition.

□

An example of the bijection may be illustrative. Let our modulus be $m = 5$.

Let our starting partition be $(9, 9, 8, 8, 8, 7, 6, 6, 6, 6, 5, 5, 5, 4, 4, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1)$. We observe that its alternating sum type is $(1, 2, 1, 1)$. Its conjugate is $\lambda = (22, 19, 15, 15, 13, 10, 6, 5, 2)$.

Write the 5-modular diagram of this partition:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
2 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 \\
4 & 5 & 5 & 5 & \\
5 & 5 & 5 & & \\
5 & 5 & 5 & & \\
3 & 5 & 5 & & \\
5 & 5 & & & \\
1 & 5 & & & \\
5 & & & & \\
2 & & & &
\end{array}$$

The first parts we remove are those which can be removed whole without destroying 5-flatness. We can remove the parts 5 (because $6 - 2 = 4$), not the 10, and one of the 15s but not the second (the first because it is repeated, but not the second because $19 - 13 = 6$). So far $\sigma \cdot 5 = (15, 5) = (3, 1) \cdot 5$.

The remaining partition is now $(22, 19, 15, 13, 10, 6, 2)$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
2 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 \\
4 & 5 & 5 & 5 & \\
5 & 5 & 5 & & \\
3 & 5 & 5 & & \\
5 & 5 & & & \\
1 & 5 & & & \\
2 & & & &
\end{array}$$

We remove the part 15, and in addition subtract 5 from 22 and 19. Thus, we add the part 25 to 5σ, obtaining $(25, 15, 5)$ so far, and are left with the following partition, $(17, 14, 13, 10, 6, 2)$:

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
2 & 5 & 5 & 5 \\
4 & 5 & 5 & \\
3 & 5 & 5 & \\
5 & 5 & & \\
1 & 5 & & \\
2 & & &
\end{array}$$

Finally we remove the 10 and a 5 from each of the previous three larger parts, adding a 25 to σ and finishing with $\sigma \cdot 5 = (25, 25, 15, 5) = (5, 5, 3, 1) \cdot 5$, and $\pi = (12, 9, 8, 6, 2)$:

$$\begin{array}{lll} 2 & 5 & 5 \\ 4 & 5 & \\ 3 & 5 & \\ 1 & 5 & \\ 2 & & \end{array}$$

To combine these into a new partition we conjugate σ, obtaining $\sigma' = (4, 3, 3, 2, 2)$, and add 5 times this partwise to π:

$$\begin{array}{lllllll} 2 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 \\ 4 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 & & \\ 3 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 & & \\ 1 & 5 & 5 & 5 & & & \\ 2 & 5 & 5 & & & & \end{array}$$

Our final partition is $(32, 24, 23, 16, 12)$. Its length type is $(1, 2, 1, 1)$, as desired.

If we were to reverse our map, we would observe that σ' has five parts of size at least 2 since the smallest part of μ is $2 + 5 + 5$, and so forth obtain σ; observing that the largest part of σ is 5, we determine that we should set $i = 3$, since setting $i = 4$ is too large (adding part 5 and following it by $1 + 5 + 5$ would not result in a flat partition), whereas $i = 2$ would not result in a partition at all (15 preceded by 14). The other insertions are likewise unique.

References

[1] Bessenrodt, C. A bijection for Lebesgues partition identity in the spirit of Sylvester, Discrete Math. 132 (1994) 1-10.

[2] Keith, W. J. Ranks of Partitions and Durfee Symbols. Ph.D. Thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 2007. Published online at http://etda.libraries.psu.edu/theses/approved/WorldWideIndex/ETD-2026/index.html

[3] Pak, I. Partition Bijections, a Survey. The Ramanujan Journal, 2006, Vol. 12, pp. 5-75.

[4] Pak, I., and Postnikov, A. A generalization of Sylvesters Identity, Discrete Math. 178 (1998), 277-281.

[5] Stockhofe, D. Bijektive Abbildungen auf der Menge der Partitionen einer naturlichen Zahl. Ph.D. thesis. Bayreuth. Math. Schr. (10), 1-59 (1982)

[6] Sylvester, J. J. A constructive theory of partitions, arranged in three acts, an interact and an exodion, Amer. J. Math. 5 (1882), 251-330.

[7] Xiong, X. Euler's partition theorem for all moduli and new companions to Rogers-Ramanujan-Andrews-Gordon identities. arXiv preprint, https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.07583